

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The South Dakota Part B State Performance Plan obtained broad stakeholder involvement throughout the process. This included:

- The SPP/APR stakeholder workgroup met to review, revise, and develop baseline and activities for new indicators for State Performance Plan and the Annual Performance Report to be presented to the Governor's Advisory Panel for Children with Disabilities for their input. This work group consisted of people representing Special Education Programs personnel, higher education, local special education directors, local special education teachers, education cooperatives, education service agencies, Transition Services Liaison Project staff, parent representation, South Dakota Association of School Psychologists, the Council of Administrators of Special Education, South Dakota Advocacy, Birth to 3 Connections, education specialists, and Children's Care Hospital and School. The work group met in December 2006. The specific tasks requested of work group members were:
 - Review baseline and trend data for each indicator where such information was available;
 - Assist in revising or determining appropriate targets for each indicator where a target was required for the State Performance Plan;
 - Review the planned activities, timelines, and resources and provide input into the likely efficacy of the strategies proposed;
 - Suggest additional approaches for the Special Education Programs to consider including in the planned activities.
 - Review 2005-2006 baseline data for new indicators and develop targets and activities for new indicators.
- In addition to the stakeholder work group, the SPP was submitted to our broad stakeholder group, the Governor's Advisory Panel for Children with Disabilities for their input, comments, and changes in January, 2007. The Governor's Advisory Panel for Children with Disabilities is made up of parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, a representative from higher education, representatives from other state agencies, administrators, state and local officials, a representative dealing with transitional needs, and a representative from juvenile and adult corrections. A majority of the members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.
- Along with stakeholder input, Special Education Programs personnel have continually participated in OSEP and Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center's (MPRRC) conference calls to gain more knowledge about the SPP/APR process and indicators. MPRRC has continued to assist Special Education Programs through calls and emails with this process. Special Education Programs staff plans to attend national and regional conferences on topics dealing with the State Performance Plan indicators in the future.
- To ensure statistically sound data, a minimum number (N) will be applied where appropriate. The necessity of applying a statistical analysis and a minimum N to certain target indicators was due to exceptionally small numbers in our state. A minimum number large enough to provide both valid and reliable target determinations will be set

for certain target indicators. South Dakota will be utilizing a minimum N to help ensure confidentiality of students in South Dakota public schools as well as to ensure statistically sound data. For all NCLB data South Dakota uses a minimum N of 10. Special Education Programs will follow South Dakota NCLB protocol.

- Following the submission of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report to the U.S. Department of Education, Special Education Programs will disseminate the State Performance Plan, Annual Progress Report (APR), and Local Education Agency (LEA) information in the following ways:
 - Post the final version and State Performance Plan, Annual Progress Report, LEA information and 618 tables on the agency website at <http://doe.sd.gov/oess/specialed/SPP/index.asp>
 - Alert constituency groups via existing list serves, email and workshops.
 - Presentation session at the State Council for Exceptional Children.
 - Regional presentations throughout the state in February and March.
 - South Dakota Parent Connection will announce publication of the Part B State Performance Plan on the Special Education Programs website in the newsletter "The Circuit" so parents can access it.
 - Hard copies will be provided to all Advisory Panel members
 - Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternative format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the

South Dakota Department of Education
Attn: Special Education Programs
700 Governor's Drive
Pierre, SD 57501
- Hard copies will also be made available for public review at Department of Education, Special Education Program office. Public notice about the availability of the State Performance Plan, APR, and LEA information reporting will be made in a press release to major South Dakota newspapers.
- Special Education Programs will be publicly reporting at the district level on the required indicators no later than March 1, 2007. Public reporting information on the State 618 data tables will also be available no later than March 1, 2007. Access of this information will be made available on the Office of Educational Services and Support, Special Education Programs website at the following link:
<http://doe.sd.gov/oess/specialed/SPP/index.asp>

Information discussed throughout the APR:

The South Dakota Department of Education (SDDOE) has been working on goals dealing with Governor Rounds 2010 Education Initiative announced in Fall of 2005. The 2010 Education Initiative is a series of specific goals and action plans intended to improve the state's education system by the year 2010. Once the vision of 2010E is fully realized, South Dakota will have an education system that is second to none in America - brimming with opportunity and innovative thinking. Special Education Programs feels the 2010 Education Initiative incorporates many of the goals, objectives, and strategies that are found

throughout the State Performance Plan. Special Education Programs will explain the implementation of the goals that pertain to the SPP throughout the APR, with which the entire SDDOE is working toward.

Goals in 2010 Education Initiative are:

Goal 1: By 2010, all third grade students will be proficient- or on a plan to become proficient- in reading and math. This goal will contribute to meeting the targets for Indicators 3, 5, 6, and 7.

Goal 2: By 2010, South Dakota will be first in the nation for the percentage of students going on to college, technical school or advanced training. This goal will contribute to meeting the targets for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14.

Goal 3: By 2010, the postsecondary education system will fully meet the needs of the state's changing economy and its citizens. This goal will contribute to meeting the targets for Indicator 14.

Goal 4: By 2010, South Dakota will build its educator base through targeted recruitment, retention and training. This goal will contribute to meeting the targets for Indicators 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 11.

Goal 5: By 2010, South Dakota will increase educational outcomes for Native American students. This goal will contribute to meeting the targets for indicators 1 through 14.

Goal 6: By 2010, South Dakota will target financial resources to improve classroom instruction and educational opportunities. This goal will contribute to meeting the targets for all indicators.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

(Definitions and calculations recorded in the South Dakota State Performance Plan at <http://doe.sd.gov/oess/specialed/SPP/index.asp>) The formula used is the formula from the state's NCLB accountability workbook.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-2006	80% of youth with Individual Education Plans will graduate from high school with a regular diploma.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Target was met by South Dakota

Based on the formula below, South Dakota calculates 82.6% of youth with Individual Education Plans graduated from high school with a regular diploma in 2005-2006.

In 2005-2006 school year, 557 students with disabilities graduated with a high school diploma. In this cohort, 117 students with disabilities dropped out and did not return to school.

$$557/(557+117)=.826 \quad .826 \times 100 = 82.6\% \text{ IEP youth graduation rate}$$

Based on the formula below, South Dakota calculates percentage of all youth graduated from high school with a regular diploma in 2005-2006.

In 2005-2006 school year, 9067 students graduated with a high school diploma. In this cohort, 1017 students dropped out and did not return to school.

$$9067/(9067+1017)=.899 \quad .899 \times 100 = 89.9\% \text{ all youth graduation rate}$$

High School Completers in Year 4
Dropouts (Gr 9, year 1 + Gr 10, year 2 + Gr 11, year 3
+ Gr 12, year 4) + HS Completers, Year 4

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Explanation of Progress made for 2005-2006:

The data using the new calculation shows that progress was made with 82.6% of youth with Individual Education Plans graduated from high school with a regular diploma compared to 89.9% of all youth.

The actual target for 2005-2006 was 80%. The target was determined in December 2005 because 9th graders were going to be added to the calculation in the 2005-2006 school year. The stakeholder group determined to keep the same targets for the next 6 years to look at trend data when adding 9th graders to the calculation. If the trend continues to show improvement from 82.6%, stakeholders will adjust the targets for the coming years.

Special Education Programs and SPP/APR stakeholder group attributes some of the progress made in exceeding the graduation rate target for students with disabilities to the 2010 Education Initiative.

Finishing Strong

Goal 2: By 2010, South Dakota will be first in the nation for the percentage of students going on to college, technical school or advanced training.

Objective 2A: Graduate 95 percent of high school students.

Initiatives:

- a. Require compulsory attendance to age 18
- b. Implement personal learning plans for students
- c. Create senior project models
- d. Implement internship programs
- e. Increase use of advanced placement/dual credit courses
- f. Create a state scholars program that connects schools to businesses

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for 2005-2006:

Special Education Programs and SPP/APR stakeholder group also attributes the completion of the following activities which assisted the state in exceeding the graduation target:

Activity	Timeline	Completion and Evaluation
Provide graduation and post-secondary planning activities for at risk middle school special education students.	Fall 2006 and ongoing through 2011	Transition Services Liaison Project staff began meeting with guidance counselors during a workshop and on-site visits.
Develop collaboration between high schools and post secondary schools to help special education students prepare for post secondary education through "Catch the Wave" conference.	Spring 2006 and annually through 2011	Catch the Wave Conference has steadily increased over the 6 years it has been implemented. In 2006, three regional sites had 195 students, staff, and parents involved. Due to the increase in participants at the regional sites, an additional "Catch the Wave" conference has been established for Spring of 2007.
Promote work experience through "Project Skills" program for HS special education students.	2005-2011	Project Skills has seen an increase in the number of districts participating from 37 in 2004-2005 to 46 in the 2005-2006 school year.
Provide career leadership training through the Youth Leadership Forum (YLF) for special education high school juniors and seniors to serve as delegates from their communities.	Summer 2006 and annually through 2011	YLF numbers are based on the number of students selected to attend. We usually get between 40 and 60 applications each year and select approximately 36 to attend through an application and interview process. In 2007 year, we received 53 applications. Over 300 students have participated in the YLF conference since implementation.
Provide a "Summer Teacher Institute" annually. The institute is an in-depth transition to adulthood training designed specifically for high school special education teachers. The institute is held in conjunction with YLF to share speakers and panel discussion	June 2006 and annually through 2011	Summer Teacher Institute has steadily increased the number of participants over the past 4 years. In 2006, 44 secondary special education teachers participated.

topics. The participants also learn about transition assessment, self advocacy, transition process, service providers, etc...		
---	--	--

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:

Discussion of Revision of Improvement Activity with Justification:

The SPP/APR stakeholder workgroup identified the following improvement activities as needing revision. New improvement activities have also been added to the State Performance Plan.

Activities	Revisions and justifications
Identified the districts that met or exceeded the state's target and the districts that did not meet the target.	The timeline of Summer will need to be adjusted to Fall since the information for NCLB collection is not finalized until after October.
Evaluate what effective programs promote graduation and create a menu for districts to use that would be beneficial to their demographics.	Since finalized data was not received until end of October for district specific information, evaluation of effective programs will occur Spring of 2007 and on-going.
Provide technical assistance to districts shown with the lowest 5% of graduating students through coordinated set of transition activities.	Transition Services Liaison Project staff has worked with districts on coordinated set of activities and will continue to target the districts that show the lowest rates.
New Activities: Disaggregate state level data by disability category, ethnicity, and geographic regions to identify trends in data to inform improvement activities	Spring 2007 and on-going
Technical Assistance and Training: Direct instruction Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS)	Winter 2007 and on-going Districts that did not meet indicators 1, 2, and 4 in 2004-2005 are going to implement in 2006-2007 school year, PBIS. South Dakota will be following their data to determine if this is an effective program for other districts. Direct Instruction training has research that can be effective program. Training will be provided.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: See pg. 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

(Definitions and calculations recorded in the South Dakota State Performance Plan at <http://doe.sd.gov/oess/specialed/SPP/index.asp>)

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-2006	5% of students of disabilities are dropping out of high school.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Target was met by South Dakota.

Calculation:

The data for computing special education dropout rate is gathered through an analysis of accumulated special education enrollment for grades 9-12 divided by the accumulated special education enrollment for grades 9-12 plus total special education drop outs reported for grades 9-12. Then the number derived is deducted from 100 percent to get the percent of special education dropouts for current year. Accumulated enrollment for special education included any students who were on an IEP during the school year.

Special Education Youth Dropout rate: 3.9%

$$N = 4374/4550 = .961$$

$$.961 \times 100 = 96.1\%$$

$$100\% - 96.1\% = 3.9\%$$

2005-2006 state data showed that 4374 students with disabilities in grades 9-12 were enrolled in South Dakota and 176 students with disabilities dropped out of school during the 2005-2006 school year. Based on the above calculations, the percentage of high school students with disabilities that dropped out is 3.9%.

All Youth Dropout rate: 3.4%

$$N = 41,498 / 42,974 = .966$$

$$.966 \times 100$$

$$100\% - 96.6\% = 3.4\%$$

2005-2006 state data showed that 9067 students in grades 9-12 were enrolled in South Dakota and 1017 students dropped out of school during the 2005-2006 school year. Based on the above calculations, the percentage of all high school students that dropped out is 3.4%.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:**Explanation of Progress made for 2005-2006:**

South Dakota has made progress with decreasing the special education dropout rate from 5.03% to 3.9% over the past year. Dropout rate for all students declined from 3.57% to 3.4%.

According to the data and NCLB promotion of students graduating from high school, districts are making significant improvements in retaining students with disabilities in school. They are narrowing the gap between all students and special education students dropping out of high school.

The stakeholder group felt that another reason for progress being made in lowering the dropout rate for students with disabilities as well as all students could be attributed to the focus in South Dakota's 2010 E Initiatives of graduation.

Since there was a significant drop of students with disabilities dropping out of high school compared to all students, the stakeholder group felt that an additional year of data should be collected before revision of any target activities could be determined.

Finishing Strong

Goal 2: By 2010, South Dakota will be first in the nation for the percentage of students going on to college, technical school or advanced training.

Objective 2A: Graduate 95 percent of high school students.

Initiatives:

- g. Require compulsory attendance to age 18
- h. Implement personal learning plans for students
- i. Create senior project models
- j. Implement internship programs
- k. Increase use of advanced placement/dual credit courses
- l. Create a state scholars program that connects schools to businesses

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for 2005-2006:

Special Education Programs and the SPP/APR stakeholder group also attribute the completion of the following activities which assisted the state in meeting the target:

Activity	Timeline	Completion and Evaluation
Provide graduation and post-secondary planning activities for at risk middle school special education students.	Fall 2006 and ongoing through 2011	Transition Services Liaison Project staff began meeting with guidance counselors during a workshop and on-site visits.
Set up a data base to be used by districts when entering student exit information.	Spring 2006	This was completed in March of 2006 and district staff began entering information for post-secondary outcomes interviews for spring 2007. Reasons why students dropped out of school will be collected in Spring of 2007 during the 1 year follow up survey. We feel this will be very useful information for both districts and the state.
Develop collaboration between high schools and post secondary schools to help special education students prepare for post secondary education through "Catch the Wave" conference.	Spring 2006 and annually through 2011	Catch the Wave Conference has steadily increased over the 6 years it has been implemented. In 2006, three regional sites had 195 students, staff, and parents involved. Due to the increase in participants at the regional sites, an additional "Catch the Wave" conference has been established for Spring of 2007.
Promote work experience through "Project Skills" program for HS special education students.	2005-2011	Project Skills has seen an increase in the number of districts participating from 37 in 2004-2005 to 46 in the 2005-2006 school year.

Provide career leadership training through the Youth Leadership Forum (YLF) for special education high school juniors and seniors to serve as delegates from their communities.	Summer 2006 and annually through 2011	YLF numbers are based on the number of students selected to attend. We usually get between 40 and 60 applications each year and select approximately 36 to attend through an application and interview process. In 2007 year, we received 53 applications. Over 300 students have participated in the YLF conference since implementation.
Provide a “Summer Teacher Institute” annually. The institute is an in-depth transition to adulthood training designed specifically for high school special education teachers. The institute is held in conjunction with YLF to share speakers and panel discussion topics. The participants also learn about transition assessment, self advocacy, transition process, service providers, etc...	June 2006 and annually through 2011	Summer Teacher Institute has steadily increased number of participants over the past 4 years. In 2006, 44 secondary special education teachers participated.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:

Discussion of Revision of Improvement Activity with Justification:

Special Education Programs and the SPP/APR stakeholder workgroup decided on the following revisions to improvement activities and the addition of new activities.

Activities	Revisions and Justifications
Identified the districts that met or exceed the state’s target and the districts that did not meet the target.	The timeline of Spring will need to be adjusted to Fall since the information for NCLB collection is not finalized until after October.
Evaluate what effective programs promote graduation and create a menu for districts to use that would be beneficial to their demographics.	Since finalized data was not received until end of October for district specific information, evaluate of effective programs will occur Spring of 2007 and on-going.
Provide technical assistance to districts that have the highest dropout rate of students through coordinated set of transition activities.	Transition Services Liaison Project staff has worked with districts on coordinated set of activities and will continue to target the districts that have the highest dropout rate. TSLP also held 4 workshops across the state

APR Template – Part B (4)

__South Dakota__
State

	on the new 2004 IDEA requirements for transition along with creating a technical assistance guide on coordinated set of transitional activities.
New Activities: Disaggregate state level data by disability category, ethnicity, and geographic regions to identify trends in data to inform improvement activities	Spring 2007 and on-going
Technical Assistance and Training: Direct instruction Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS)	Winter 2007 and on-going Districts that did not meet indicators 1, 2, and 4 in 2004-2005 are going to implement in 2006-2007 school year, PBIS. South Dakota will be following their data to determine if this is an effective program for other districts. Direct Instruction training has research that can be effective program. Training with be provided.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: See page 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**Indicator 3:** Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs)}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size in the State})] \times 100$.
- B. Participation rate =
 - a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
 - b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $[(b) \div (a)] \times 100$);
 - c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $[(c) \div (a)] \times 100$);
 - d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = $[(d) \div (a)] \times 100$); and
 - e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = $[(e) \div (a)] \times 100$).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = $[(b + c + d + e) \div (a)]$.

C. Proficiency rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $[(b) \div (a)] \times 100$);
- c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $[(c) \div (a)] \times 100$);

APR Template – Part B (4)

__South Dakota__
State

- d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target			
(2005)	Measurable and Rigorous Target			
	Indicators		Reading	Math
	A. Districts meeting AYP in disability subgroup		96%	96%
	B. Participation rate for students with disabilities		97.7%.	98%.
	C. Proficiency rate for students with disabilities	K-8	78%	65%
9-12		66%	54%	

Actual Target Data for (2005):

Target A: Target was met by South Dakota.

Target B: Target was met by South Dakota.

Target C: Target was not met by South Dakota.

A. Actual Target Data for Districts meeting AYP in disability subgroup for 2005-2006:

Year	Total Number of Districts	Districts meeting AYP status for students with disabilities in Reading	Percent of districts meeting AYP status for students with disabilities in Reading	Districts meeting AYP status for students with disabilities in Math	Percent of districts meeting AYP status for students with disabilities in Math
Target			96%		96%
05-06	165	163	98.8%	161	97.6%

B. Actual Target Data for Participation Rate for 2005-2006:**Reading 2005-2006 Target was 97.7%**

	Children with IEPs in regular assessment without accommodations	Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	Children with IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Grade Level Standards	Children with IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Standards	Children not assessed due to Absence	Total Children with IEPs Assessed	Total Children with IEPs	Percent of students with IEPs Assessed
2005-2006 Reading								
Grade 3	997	661	NA	63	14	1721	1735	99.19%
Grade 4	714	720	NA	90	7	1524	1531	99.54%
Grade 5	635	657	NA	80	3	1372	1375	99.78%
Grade 6	458	686	NA	91	10	1235	1245	99.20%
Grade 7	439	724	NA	82	11	1245	1256	99.12%
Grade 8	398	691	NA	78	13	1167	1180	98.90%
Grade 11	319	338	NA	80	24	737	761	96.85%
Total All Grades Assessed	3960	4477	NA	564	82	9001	9083	99.10%

Math 2005-2006 Target was 98%

	Children with IEPs in regular assessment without accommodations	Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	Children with IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Grade Level Standards	Children with IEPs in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Standards	Children not assessed due to Absence	Total Children with IEPs Assessed	Total Children with IEPs	Percent of students with IEPs Assessed
2005-2006 Math								
Grade 3	1000	663	NA	63	9	1726	1735	99.48%

APR Template – Part B (4)

__South Dakota__
State

Grade 4	714	722	NA	90	5	1526	1531	99.67%
Grade 5	634	658	NA	80	3	1372	1375	99.78%
Grade 6	458	686	NA	91	10	1235	1245	99.20%
Grade 7	439	724	NA	82	11	1245	1256	99.12%
Grade 8	399	691	NA	78	12	1168	1180	98.98%
Grade 11	319	337	NA	80	25	736	761	96.71%
Total All Grades Assessed	3963	4481	NA	564	75	9008	9083	99.17%

C. Actual Target Data for Proficiency Rate for 2005-2006:

2005-2006	Reading			Math		
	K-8	9-12	Combined Total	K-8	9-12	Combined Total
Special Ed. Students Proficient on Regular Assessment without Accommodations	317	51	368	825	0	825
Special Ed. Students Proficient on Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3899	76	3975	2390	75	2465
Special Ed. Students Proficient on Alternate against grade level	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Special Ed. Students Proficient on Alternate against alternate	170	28	198	98	11	109
Total Number of Special Ed. Students Proficient	4386	155	4541	3313	86	3399
Total Number of Special Ed. Students	8264	737	9001	8272	736	9008
Percent of Special Ed. Students Proficient	53.07%	21.03%	50.45%	40.05%	11.68%	37.73%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Explanation of Progress and Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

Part A: Districts making AYP explanation of progress

South Dakota has made progress in Districts making AYP in the disability subgroup. South Dakota's State Improvement Grant, Project Enrich, works closely with districts on ways to improve Adequate Yearly Progress of students with disabilities in the areas of reading and math as one of the project's goals. South Dakota has chosen a small N size of 10 for NCLB in order to include more districts in the accountability process. All subgroups have the same N size of 10.

Part B: Participation Rate explanation of progress

South Dakota has made progress in the participation rate of students with disabilities. South Dakota has been a firm believer that districts will test all students, even students with disabilities. South Dakota Department of Education does not allow exemptions from testing unless under extreme circumstances such as significant medical emergencies and districts are required to have documentation. Because of this policy, districts work very hard to make sure all students are tested within the testing window.

Part C: Proficiency Rate explanation of slippage**Slippage of Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities:**

South Dakota showed slippage for students with significant cognitive disabilities making proficiency due to a change in the alternate achievement descriptors. In previous years, the descriptors were developed at grade spans instead of being grade level specific. Grade specific alternate achievement descriptors aligned to general content standards were developed and implemented during the 2005-2006 school year and for statewide assessment. As a result of developing grade specific alternate achievement descriptors, the alternate assessment was revised to be grade level specific and new cut scores were set. Due to higher expectations based on grade level content the number of students with significant cognitive disabilities meeting the proficient level decreased in 2006. Since South Dakota did not have one percent of the alternate assessment students meet proficiency, the percent of all special education students meeting proficiency was impacted. South Dakota expects that over the years as students are exposed and participate in grade level content that proficiency rates for students with significant cognitive disabilities will increase.

Reading:

South Dakota is seeing an increase in reading performance in the elementary grades partly due to the Reading First program. The program was initially implemented three years ago with 9 districts. Now two more districts have entered the program and are on their first year of implementation. Reading First program targets grades K-3. All students participate in the Reading First program even special education students. Districts that have implemented the Reading First program have increased percentage of students in proficient and advanced range over the 3 years of implementation. In 2006, there were no students in grade 3 of the Reading First districts that were below basic in the reading portion of the South Dakota statewide test, Dakota STEP.

Unfortunately, the high school cohort of students tested have not benefited from the Reading First program. Due to movement of students from resource room setting to more inclusive

settings and highly qualified status for special education personnel, South Dakota believes there will be an increase in high school proficiency performance for high school level students in reading.

Math slippage:

South Dakota Department of Education has identified math as an area of concern and has addressed that by implementing a program entitled "South Dakota Counts" to assist districts in improving math proficiency rates. "Counts" is a three year elementary math initiative focused on implementing research based instructional practices to improve student learning in mathematics. The 2006-2007 school year is the first year of implementation. SDDOE has implemented pathways to graduation that require all students graduating take Algebra 1 which was not a required course in the past. The 2006-2007 9th grade class will be the first required to complete the Algebra I requirement.

Special Education Programs will be coordinating with Title Programs to assist districts in making progress in the area of math and reading. One of the reasons for slippage in math is due to the implementation and assessment of new math content standards in 2005-2006. These new standards included new test questions and cut scores. South Dakota also adjusted the math AMO in our NCLB accountability workbook and the State Performance Plan to reflect the new standards. Since these targets have changed, fewer students scored in the proficient category in math.

Other South Dakota Activities used to improve performance of all students on Dakota STEP:

South Dakota will be implementing a computerized "Achievement Series" based on content standards. South Dakota teachers created a test bank of questions written from the standards. Districts and teachers will be able to pull test questions for their students once a content standard's indicator or strand has been covered. South Dakota believes this will assist in the increased performance of all students on the Dakota STEP statewide assessment.

The South Dakota Department of Education has A Curriculum Mapping System for use throughout the state's school districts. It is based on the solid foundation of Dr. Heidi Hayes Jacobs's pioneering work in the field. In the spring of 2004 South Dakota DOE competed and awarded grants to 53 South Dakota schools and school districts for curriculum mapping activities. In the spring of 2005 an additional 43 schools and school districts received a curriculum mapping grant. Special Education Teachers are also included in mapping their curriculum for students with disabilities.

2010 Education Goal 1 emphasizes third grade students being proficient in reading and math. Below is the initiative the South Dakota Department of Education will be working on to meet Goal 1 and assist in South Dakota's targets for this indicator.

Objective 1B: Demonstrate annual growth of 2 percent in reading and 5 percent in math in the primary grades (K-2), as measured by the Dakota STEP.

Initiatives:

- a. Mandatory kindergarten, effective July 1, 2010
- b. Develop training in early literacy and numeracy for K-3 teachers
- c. Create an assessment tool to measure student progress
- d. Provide technical assistance to school districts to ensure that students not demonstrating growth are on a learning plan
- e. Create and distribute a curriculum guide for parents

Discussion of Improvement Activities Complete for 2005-2006:

Through analysis and discussion, the stakeholder workgroup considered the following improvement activities to have made a positive impact on students with disabilities.

Activity	Timeline	Completion and Evaluation
Professional development activities will be provided on aligning instruction to state standards, developing rigorous curriculum to meet those standards.	October 2005 and on-going	Access Center, MPRRC, and Special Education programs conducted a workshop in 3 different locations and provided professional development on aligning instruction to state standards. Many special education teachers that work with students with significant cognitive disabilities attended this training. This was the first in a series of trainings for special education teachers dealing with standards alignment and curriculum.
Develop and conduct a workshop on Train the Trainer module for instructional and assessment accommodations.	Fall 2006 Fall 2006 and ongoing	Train the Trainer had over 20 participants that came from cooperatives, special education directors, and ESAs. Since December 8, 2006, trainers have presented information on instructional and assessment accommodations to over 400 people.
Educational Service Agency (ESA) systems comprised of seven regions throughout the state will focus on providing school improvement in the areas of reading and math.	2006 and on going through 2011	ESAs provide districts with data retreats which focus on improving the results for all children in a district on the statewide assessment annually. This is a time for districts to drill down and see problem areas and come up with objectives to meet the goals.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005**Discussion of Revision of Improvement Activity with Justification:**

South Dakota Stakeholders felt that the districts meeting AYP in the students with disabilities subgroup targets needed to be revised to more accurately reflect the actual numbers. In the original submission of the South Dakota State Performance Plan in December 2005, South Dakota had begun targets for districts meeting AYP in Special Education Subgroup at a much lower level. The table below reflects the original 2005 target and new targets set for Part A of this indicator:

Districts meeting AYP in disability subgroup	Reading	Math
Original Target for 2005	47.5%	38.5%
Revised 2005	96%	96%
Revised 2006	96%	96%
Revised 2007	97%	97%
Revised 2008	97%	97%
Revised 2009	98%	98%
Revised 2010	98%	98%

Proficiency Rate Targets for Math has been revised.

South Dakota's Math Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) were revised and approved in August 2006 to reflect the new implemented math content standards.

Math Proficiency Rate Targets	K-8	9-12
Original Target for 2005	54%	67%
Revised 2005	65%	54%
Revised 2006	65%	54%
Revised 2007	72%	63%
Revised 2008	72%	63%
Revised 2009	72%	63%
Revised 2010	79%	72%

Discussion of Revision of Improvement Activity with Justification:

The stakeholder workgroup proposed the following revisions with justifications to the improvement activities listed below. The workgroup also included a new activity that was added to the SPP.

Activities	Revisions and Justification
Special Education Programs will conduct annual analysis of student participation and proficiency rates as measured by Dakota STEP and Dakota STEP-A.	Due to information on district level data on participation and proficiency rate for the all assessed data not being completed by the contractor until December 2006, Special Education Programs will analyze the data in the Winter 2007 and annually thereafter.

APR Template – Part B (4)

__ South Dakota __
State

Examine new regulations on 2% or modified assessment.	Upon passage of final regulations and the state approved peer reviewed assessment system.	
Begin development of modified achievement descriptors if the state elects to develop a modified assessment.	Upon passage of final regulations and the state approved peer reviewed assessment system.	
New Activities, Timelines, and Resources		
Activity	Timeline	Resources
Conduct an accommodation study to verify IEP teams are providing instructional accommodations if they are also providing those accommodation on statewide assessment.	Spring and Summer of 2007	Peer Review Committee, Testing Advisory Council, Special Education Programs staff

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: See pg. 1****Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE****Indicator 4:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005	A. 1.80% of districts with suspension rates >5% of their students with disabilities populations.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:**Part 4A: Target was met by South Dakota.**

South Dakota's definition of significant discrepancy for Part A means more than 5% of the unduplicated students with disabilities at the district level with 10 or more students included in the numerator and the district child count included in the denominator.

Students with disabilities suspended or expelled at the district

÷

Child Count at the district

1 district out of 165 districts in South Dakota had a suspension rate of >5% of their students with disabilities for the 2005-2006 school year. South Dakota has a percent of 0.6% of districts.

1 district/165 total districts = 0.6%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Explanation of Progress for 4A:

South Dakota made progress for indicator 4A . Two of the three districts that had significant discrepancies in 2004-2005 did not have significant discrepancies in 2005-2006. The districts are implementing Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS) this year.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for 2005-2006:

Activity	Timeline	Completion and Evaluation
Revise our suspension and expulsion data collection to include race and ethnicity for non-disabled students As data collection changes, SEP will update existing data collection to meet reporting requirement.	April 2006 and ongoing as needed for data collection reporting requirements change.	Special Education Programs collected data on race and ethnicity. Upon approval of the new data collection form that was released by Westat in Fall of 2006, Special Education is completing revision on our data collection website.
Identify all districts with significant discrepancies and have the districts complete an analysis tool to identify reasons for significant discrepancies.	January 2006 and on going annually through 2011	Special Education Programs met with the districts and reviewed information with them. The 3 districts met with have now become pilot schools for PBIS and in November 2006 reanalyzed district data.
All districts with significant discrepancies will review their policies, procedures, and practices in the district comprehensive plan.	February 2006 and on going annually through 2011	Completed in Winter of 2006 (see below)
Conduct professional development on the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports for all districts showing significant discrepancy.	October 2005 / on going through 2011	Presentation was given by Sopris West in October 2005 at the Teacher Leadership Conference (TLC) along with an additional training at the conclusion of TLC for others to attend. The positive evaluations from this

		training validated SEPs decision to start a statewide PBIS initiative.
--	--	--

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:

Discussion of revisions with justification:

Change in definition

South Dakota's definition of significant discrepancy was changed from 2 or more students to 10 or more students included in the numerator. This change was due to the fact that the original definition did not meet the minimum N of 10 that South Dakota is using for both NCLB and State Performance Plan indicators. The correct definition is listed above. This change was decided based on stakeholder input.

Revisions to Targets:

OSEP APR Letter dated February 28, 2006 - Table A South Dakota Part B – Issues Identified in the SPP

Based upon the OSEP Letter for Indicator 4A, South Dakota revised the targets to be consistent with actual data that is generated based upon the total number of districts in the state. Due to this revision, South Dakota targets now show a decrease from 1.8% of districts to 0.6% by 2010-2011 school year as shown by the table below and in the SPP page 31.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	A) 1.80% of districts with suspension rates > 5% of their students with disabilities population
	B) Data will be collected by November 2006 and then targets will be set to be submitted in February 1, 2007 SPP.
2006 (2006-2007)	A) 1.80% of districts with suspension rates > 5% of their students with disabilities population.
	B)
2007 (2007-2008)	A) 1.20% of districts with suspension rates > 5% of their students with disabilities population

	B)
2008 (2008-2009)	A) 1.20% of districts with suspension rates > 5% of their students with disabilities population
	B)
2009 (2009-2010)	A) 0.6% of districts with suspension rates > 5% of their students with disabilities population
	B)
2010 (2010-2011)	A) 0.6% of districts with suspension rates > 5% of their students with disabilities population

OSEP APR Letter dated February 28, 2006 - Table B South Dakota Part B – Previously Identified Issues

In the SPP submission South Dakota stated that “Special Education Programs will be reviewing and, if appropriate revising its policies, procedures and practices to comply with the final regulations of IDEA 2004.” What was meant by this statement was that as soon as the final regulations come out, South Dakota will update the LEA Comprehensive Plan. This is the plan that districts complete which includes all of a district’s policies, procedures, and practices. South Dakota has in the past and continues to review policies, procedures, and practices in districts with significant discrepancies.

Districts with significant discrepancies in suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities have been identified and are required to analyze the district suspension/expulsion reporting procedures as well as reviewing the district policies, procedures and practices relating to implementation of Individualized Education Plans, procedural safeguards, and the use of positive behavioral interventions. Districts with significant discrepancies will continue to hold a joint meeting with Special Education Programs to discuss district policies, procedures and practices and devise a plan to address the significant discrepancies with follow-up from Special Education Programs (SEP) if needed.

On January 10, 1006 SEP met with the special education director from one school district to review their policies and procedures. During the meeting the problem with the high rates of suspension and expulsion was discussed the district was open to any TA the state could provide. The district was willing to participate in the states PBIS leadership team. The district also attended a presentation given by a ND school which has been using PBIS for the past two

years. The special education director is an active participant on the PBIS leadership team and the district is one of the pilot schools implementing PBIS.

On January 19, 2006 SEP met with the special education director from another school district to review their policies and procedures. The special education director was also open to any suggestions and appreciated the TA the state would be providing. The district also agreed to participate on the PBIS leadership team and attended the ND presentation. This district is also applying to be in the first cohort of schools implementing PBIS.

On January 23, 2006 SEP met with the special education director from the third school district to review their policies and procedures. The special education director shared with SEP many of the things they are doing to help bring down the rate of suspension and expulsion in their district. The district agreed to be on the PBIS leadership team and attended the ND presentation.

All three districts had policies and procedures in place which were conducive to appropriate school behavior. The policies and procedures relating to suspension and expulsion were determined to be fair and appropriate by the state staff. The state is providing on going TA to these and all districts in the area of appropriate school behavior to help lower the percentage of students with disabilities being suspended or expelled. Due to some of the procedures implemented during the 2005-2006 school year two of the three districts did not have significant discrepancies for this reporting period.

In the SPP dated December 2, 2005 SEP identified 3 districts with significant discrepancies and as noted above, met with all three districts within less than two months of identification. Special Education Programs feels it has met the OSEP required action for compliance with this requirement.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: See pg. 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**Indicator 5:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;¹
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-2006	A. 64% B. 7% C. 4.3%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:**Target was met by South Dakota.**

Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;	Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day	Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.
9712 students removed less than 21% divided by 14891 students ages 6-21.	970 students removed greater than 60% divided by 14891 students ages 6-21.	488 students in outside placements divided by 14891 students ages 6-21.
65%	6.5%	3.3%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (2005):**Discussion of Explanation of Progress that occurred for 2005-2006:**

	Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day	Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day	Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.
Explanation of Progress by SPP/APR stakeholder group and Special Education Programs	South Dakota has made progress by improvement of 1%. Due to highly qualified, the movement toward inclusion, and NCLB proficiency rate on the statewide assessment, districts are keeping students in general education classroom.	South Dakota has made progress in this area by meeting the target. Students with more severe disabilities are being served in districts. Since out of district placements are not the least restrictive environment for children, districts are trying to serve as many children as possible within their districts.	South Dakota has made progress for this area. Districts are trying to provide services to students within the district setting. Only when a district finds it absolutely necessary to place a child outside their facility does the team determine this setting.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Activity	Completion and Evaluation
Identify the 5% of districts that have the lowest regular classroom setting percentage	Special Education Programs reviewed districts with lowest classroom percentages.

Conduct training workshops for special education personnel how to deal students with behavioral and emotional problems.	Adaptive Behavior Analysis workshops were available to districts through the SIG grant and ESA.
Develop and implement a special education endorsement which can be available to all teachers in South Dakota	Endorsement was created and approved by the Board of Education on March 27, 2006 under ARSD 24:15:06:41 . It went into effect in May 2006. This will allow general education teachers with content knowledge the opportunity to receive a special education endorsement. This is available as a distance learning opportunity through some of our universities so teachers can participate online and through the Dakota Digital Network.
Provide training opportunities for special education teachers in identified districts, along with all districts, on the process of the justification of placements and necessity of the Least Restrictive Environment.	As districts are monitored and reviewed for Indicator 5, district personnel are being provided with technical assistance on justification of placement and necessity of Least Restrictive Environment.
Train SIMS data person at the district level for Special Education	<p>3 trainings were conducted in Fall of 2006 since new data requirements were implemented into the SIMS system late in fall 2006.</p> <p>Infinite exchange workshop had 40 participants</p> <p>SIMS training had 100 people in attendance.</p> <p>Special Education Directors meeting had 100 in attendance.</p> <p>This training is also available for districts to access through streaming video on the Special Education Programs website.</p>
Create a Special Education SIMS manual.	SIMS manual for special education was created to coincide with training provided to district personnel. It is also provided for anyone to review on the Department of Education website.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:
[If applicable]

Discussion of revisions of targets with justifications:

Through our stakeholder workgroup analysis and discussion of the measurable and rigorous targets for Indicator 5 a decision was made to change the targets based on how students move on the continuum. In order to decrease the number of students in the separate setting, you would expect that they move to a least restrictive setting which would most likely be >60% setting. As progress is made in reducing separate placement settings you would expect the >60% setting to increase for some time before those students are again able to transition. The target for the >60% setting was set higher to reflect this movement on the continuum.

Through our stakeholder workgroup analysis and discussion, concern was raised due to the fact that the baseline data was at 4.5% for separate settings. Yet, our target started at 3.1%. Upon further examination, the data presented to the original stakeholder group in November of 2005 was incorrect displaying 3.2% as the baseline. Corrected baseline data was obtained prior to submission on December 2, 2005 however targets were not reconsidered based on the new data. South Dakota's stakeholders believe the targets for the separate setting need to be revised due to corrected baseline data. Targets will be revisited with the stakeholder group in 2007.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target		
2005 (2005-2006)	A. <21	B. >60	C. Separate
	64%	7%	4.3%
2006 (2006-2007)	64%	7%	4.3%
2007 (2007-2008)	65%	6.5%	4.0%
2008 (2008-2009)	65%	6.5%	4.0%
2009 (2009-2010)	65%	6.5%	4.0%
2010 (2010-	66%	6%	3.8%

2011)

Discussion of revisions of activities with justifications:

The SPP/APR Stakeholder workgroup decided on the following activity revision and the justification for that decision.

Activities	Revision and Justification
Provide training opportunities for the general classroom educators in identified districts, along with all districts, concerning modifications and accommodations, teaching strategies and disability awareness training.	<p>2007 – 2008 school year will be the new timeline start for this activity. As data from other indicators are being taken into consideration, it will assist the Special Education Programs to target districts in need of assistance in this area. It will also allow for collaboration with the resources listed below:</p> <p>University Training Programs, Special Education Programs, Educational Service Agency, Title, Office of Curriculum Technology and Assessment (OCTA)</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: See pg. 1

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of preschool children with IEPs who received special education services in settings with typically developing peers) divided by the (total # of preschool children with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
(2005)	South Dakota will increase the percentage of preschool children with IEPs who receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers to 52%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:**Target was not met by South Dakota.**

South Dakota had 1321 students in settings with typically developing peers. There were 2742 students in ages 3-5 on child count. Based on the calculations, South Dakota's actual target for 2005 is 48%.

$$1321/2742 = 48\%$$

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:**Explanation of Slippage:**

In looking at the data from 2005-2006, the SPP/APR stakeholder group determined the numbers of children in Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) settings for the largest districts has skewed the data toward more restrictive settings for the entire state. The largest districts in the state offer a special education preschool for students with disabilities. The top 20 districts on child count had 931 students in ECSE setting out of the 1321 across the state. This accounted for 70% of 3-5 year olds in the ECSE. In addition, many of our smaller districts reported 90% to 100% of their children in ECSE settings.

Currently, early childhood preschools are not funded in South Dakota. Many districts are unable to offer a district preschool due to financial reasons. Because of this, many districts only have the option of providing services in an early childhood special education setting.

Due to the change in least restrictive environment for 3-5 year olds, Special Education Programs and stakeholders are anticipating a change in students with disabilities participating with non-disabled peers to increase even for the districts with Special Education Preschool settings.

Along with the changes in the 3-5 year old least restrictive environment, through the 2010 Education Initiative Goal 1, the South Dakota Department of Education has chosen access to quality preschool programs for 4-year olds as a strategy to meet Goal 1.

Baseline and targets will be revised based on new federal early childhood placement categories for 2006-2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Activity	Timeline	Completion and Evaluation
Data will be disaggregated at the district level. Disseminate information on the percent of preschool children with IEPs who receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers for each district and show their comparison to the state target.	Summer 2006 and annually through 2011	As the data show above, the South Dakota SEP has completed the disaggregated data and dissemination of information.
Collaborate with South Dakota Department of Education Early Childhood Workgroup focusing on preschool initiatives.	2006 and ongoing	Special Education Programs is continuing to have input into the preschool initiatives.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:

Discussion of revisions of activities with justifications:

The SPP/APR Stakeholder workgroup decided on the following activity revisions and the justifications for those decisions.

Activities	Revisions and Justifications
A Technical Assistance document will be sent to every district in the state defining Least Restrictive Environment options and SIMS codes for early childhood settings.	<p>2007-2008 school year</p> <p>Since final regulations and updated data requirements came out in Fall of 2006, Special Education Programs will begin to create the technical assistance document for districts along with DDN, workshops, etc...</p> <p>Special Education Programs, Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC), National Early Childhood Technical assistance Center (NECTAC)</p>
Districts will disaggregate data on 04-05 preschool special education children as a part of this effort.	Activity will be eliminated due to new preschool least restrict environment changes.
<p>Develop a survey to send to districts to determine what preschool options are available in their districts.</p> <p>Collect and tabulate the information to be used by Special Education Programs for data comparison.</p>	<p>Summer 2006 through 2007</p> <p>This is revised due to 2010 Education Initiative to determine the feasibility of preschools in the state. SD DOE hired University of South Dakota to conduct a study. Special Education Programs will use this information once it is available by Fall 2007.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
(2005)	(Insert Measurable and Rigorous Target.)

Actual Target Data for (2005):

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (2005):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (2005)
[If applicable]

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for _____

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
(2005)	(Insert Measurable and Rigorous Target.)

Actual Target Data for (2005):

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (2005):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (2005)

[If applicable]

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for _____

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-2006	0% of districts

Actual Target Data for:

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (2005):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (2005)
[If applicable]

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for _____

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-2006	0% of districts

Baseline Data for 2005-2006:

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (2005):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (2005)
[If applicable]

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for _____

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

Account for children included in a but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b + c) divided by (a)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
	(Insert Measurable and Rigorous Target.)

Actual Target Data for (): Baseline Year

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (2005):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (2005)
[If applicable]

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: See pg. 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c or d. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a – b – d)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
(2005)	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.

Actual Target Data for (2005):

Target was met by South Dakota.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B Effective Transition Indicator #12		
	Measurement	2005-2006
A.	# of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.	574
B.	#of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays	128

APR Template – Part B (4)

___ South Dakota ___
State

C.	# of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	393
D.	# of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.	53
Calculation: Percent = [C divided by (a-b-d)] times 100.		
574–128-53 = 393/393 = 1X100 = 100%		

South Dakota's actual data for 2005 is 100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:

Explanation of Progress:

South Dakota put a system in place for collecting Indicator 12 data showing the reasons for NOT having an IEP in place by the child's third birthday. The 619 coordinator collected this documentation which helped South Dakota to meet the target. An example of the documentation South Dakota collected during 2005-2006 included: documentation that parent's refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Activity	Timeline	Completion and evaluations
Part C staff will collect data monthly for all children who are Part B eligible, but who did not have an IEP in place by their third birthday. Part B 619 coordinator will contact districts to find out the reason for the IEP not being in place by the child's third birthday.	January 2006 through 2011	Part B 619 coordinator met with Part C staff to ensure all children were located. 619 coordinator contacted all districts to find out the reasons for child not on an IEP by their third birthday. As the data indicates, this was completed and analysis of data which allowed South Dakota to meet the target.
Part B 619 coordinator will compile district information to determine valid and invalid reasons for the IEP not in place by the child's third birthday.	February 2006 and on going through 2011	
Continue to develop greater communication between Part B and Part C staff.	2006 and on going through 2011	619 coordinator worked with Part C staff on a monthly basis discussing information dealing with Indicator 7 and 12. They collaborated on BDI 2 trainings and updating of forms.

APR Template – Part B (4)

___South Dakota___
State

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:

[If applicable]

Discussion of revision of activity with justification:

Activity	Timeline	Revision and Justification
Eligibility guide will be updated to include the necessary evaluations for those students transitioning from Part C to Part B	Summer 2007	Due to final regulations not being released until August of 2006, the eligibility guide is going through the final phases of the process but will not be an approved document in South Dakota until summer of 2007.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005-2006	2005 is a baseline year (see SD State Performance Plan)

Actual Baseline Data for (2005-2006):

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (2005):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for ()
[If applicable]

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for _____

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
(2005)	Target will be set in February 1, 2008 APR

Actual Target Data for (2005):

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (2005):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (2005)
[If applicable]

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: See pg. 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions that the State has taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
(2005)	100% of noncompliance completed within one year

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:**Target was not met by South Dakota.**

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance. 257
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. 178

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

$$178/257 \times 100 = 69.26\%$$

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (2005):

Explanation of Slippage in the monitoring of districts in 2004-2005 with compliance completion due in 2005-2006:

The target for the state is 100%, South Dakota did not meet this target. The monitoring data we are using is based off of districts that were monitored during the 2004-2005 school year with noncompliance needing to be completed during the 2005-2006 school year. South Dakota's new Special Education State Director learned this information at the OSEP Leadership Conference in August 2005. Since then, South Dakota has implemented the correct timelines for correcting noncompliance; however, for this past year we still have to use data that was collected by the old monitoring system when we did not have the correct one year timeline in place which is described as follows:

Previous to the fall of 2005, South Dakota's monitoring timeline did not start until the Improvement Plan Progress Report was approved by Special Education Programs. This timeline was changed for the districts that were monitored in 2005-2006. The 12 month timeline now begins as soon as districts receive the report and letter from Special Education Programs stating the areas of noncompliance. This requires Education Specialists, district special education directors, and Special Education Program staff to work quickly to complete the district's Improvement Plan Progress Report (IPPR) within 12 months of receiving the letter of identified noncompliance. Special Education Programs implemented this through OSEP's clarifications on what constitutes a year.

Districts that were monitored in the fall and winter of 2004 were under the timeframe from when the Improvement Plan was issued, not the date of the compliance report. SEP was also not counting the summer months, so that put all the Improvement plans back even three months further. Since Special Education Programs did not realize it was using the wrong timeframe until August of 2005, sanctions were not issued to those districts due to the fact the districts were still within their one year timeframe under the old guidelines. SEP did work with the districts to complete compliance as soon as possible.

Some districts that were monitored later in the 2004-2005 school year did get all their compliance issues completed within the one year of identification. This was due to SEP's work with the districts once we found out about the correct timeline. There were 36 sites monitored during the 04-05 school year, 17 of those schools closed their compliance issues within one year of the report date for a 53% closure rate of sites.

There was one district that had sanctions imposed. A letter was sent to the district explaining what sanctions would be implemented if correction of noncompliance was not received within a three month timeframe. SEP required documentation to be turned in as well as an onsite visit to give technical assistance and to look over the issues of concern. The district did take corrective actions and demonstrated compliance with all identified issues. The district is having a follow up visit during February 2007 to ensure they are still following correct procedures.

Compliance issues are sorted in to three categories, FAPE, General Supervision and LRE.

- FAPE includes: evaluation, IEP, graduation
- GS includes: child find, transition, complaints, due process
- LRE includes: LRE

During the 2004-2005 school year, there were 129 issues in FAPE, 126 issues in General Supervision and 2 issues in LRE that were found out of compliance in the school districts and agencies. There were 36 sites monitored during the 04-05 school year, 17 of those districts and

agencies closed their compliance issues within one year of the report date for a 53% closure rate of sites.

Discussion of Progress for districts monitored in 2005-2006 with noncompliance due to be completed in 2006-2007:

Closure rates for the districts and agencies monitored in the 2005-2006 school year show that with the implementation of the correct one year completion of noncompliance, South Dakota will be able to meet the target in the FFY 2006 APR: 37 sites were visited and 34 sites had their out of compliance issues closed within one year. The remaining 3 districts have not reached their one year time line. As of January 2007, South Dakota has a 100% closure rate of noncompliance issues within one year of written identification. South Dakota is projecting the remaining 3 districts will also meet the closure of noncompliance issues within the district's one year timeline.

OSEP APR Letter dated February 28, 2006 - Table A South Dakota Part B – Issues Identified in the SPP

South Dakota has reviewed and revised the policies on its general supervision system. South Dakota now identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. In this APR South Dakota has not reached the 100% target due to the fact that the data we are using is based on schools monitored in 2004-2005 with closure based on our previous timeline. As demonstrated in the paragraph above, South Dakota will be able to demonstrate full compliance and meet the target of 100% of noncompliance completed within one year for the next APR reporting period of February 1, 2008.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

The stakeholder workgroup feels that the completion of the following activities will ensure that South Dakota will be in compliance and meet the target in the FFY 2006 APR.

Activity	Timeline	Completion and Evaluations
Formed a partnership with National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM)	September 2005	NCSEAM met with Special Education Programs for a data and SPP training. Stakeholders were also in attendance. NCSEAM assisted South Dakota in ways to drill down and determine if noncompliance and/or performance below the target is systemic or localized.
Notify all monitored districts that all noncompliance issues must be completed within one year	January 2006	Districts were notified and monitoring forms were updated to reflect closures within one calendar year of written report.

APR Template – Part B (4)

__ South Dakota __
State

Partner with NCSEAM to facilitate analyzing state monitoring data	July 2006	NCSEAM met with staff to review state data and discuss focus monitoring.
Develop new forms for tracking Monitoring data, Improvement Plan Progress Report data, & district correspondence. SEP staff will input Improvement Plan Progress Report dates into their calendar and will complete Improvement Plan Progress Report follow-up as scheduled.	August 2006	Completed with all forms updated. Monitoring coordinator alerts SEP staff of district timelines and ensures follow-up as scheduled.
Require technical assistance to all districts/agencies that are not close to compliance by their eighth month Improvement Plan Progress Report.	2006 and ongoing through 2011	Special Education Programs had three districts not closed by the 8 th month submission; of those four districts, three districts are now closed. The last district will have on-site technical assistance in February 2007 to ensure closure within the one year timeline.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:

Discussion of activity revisions with Justification:

The SPP/APR stakeholder proposed the following changes with justifications to the improvement activities:

Activity	Revisions and Justification
Revise current monitoring system to include all indicators and noncompliance areas identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.)	Revisions to the timeline from August 2006 to Winter 2007 and Spring 2007 is due to final data being available to determine appropriate monitoring using the State Performance Plan indicators.
Training to districts on revised monitoring system	September 2007 and annually through 2011 Timeline is revised from December 2006 to September 2007 and annually through 2011. The timeline is revised to allow for review of

APR Template – Part B (4)

__South Dakota__
State

	all State Performance Plan data. Monitoring plan will use this data.
Review and revise monitoring process include a representative distribution	Eliminated due to South Dakota moving toward a more focused monitoring approach that will include all areas of general supervision.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: See pg. 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005	100% of signed written complaints will be investigated and have reports issued within the 60-day timeline, or have documentation of a timeline extension for exceptional circumstances.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:

Target was met by South Dakota.

SECTION A: Signed, written complaints	
(1) Signed, written complaints total	4
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	4
(a) Reports with findings	4
(b) Reports within timeline	4
(c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	0
(1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	0

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:**Explanation of Progress:**

South Dakota utilizes contract complaint investigators. These investigators have yearly training and many have a special education legal background. Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC) facilitates teleconference calls for State complaint investigators to discuss and share ideas for improving skills and to improve understanding and clarification of special education law, consistent with OSEP interpretation, on matters that may be the subject of a complaint. South Dakota's contract complaint investigators are part of this workgroup.

The SPP/APR stakeholder group also felt that the South Dakota Navigator Program which is a SEP funded project through the South Dakota Parent Connection helps to keep the numbers of complaints, mediations and due process hearings low in South Dakota.

Parents and districts prefer to work at the lowest level to settle problems as much as possible. Recent satisfaction surveys show that on a ten point scale parents gave the Navigators and average score of 9.6. Some of the parent comments include: Navigator helped me to have more confidence when dealing with the school; it is great to have the support of someone who knows the system; great experience; became more educated on IEP rules, etc.

Recent satisfaction surveys from school representatives gave the Navigators and average score of 7.4 on a ten point scale. Some of the comments included: Very helpful – looked at issues from all sides and added expertise; parents benefit from informed advocacy; it is always good to have input from a third party that is knowledgeable about special education; helped the school and family reach a positive outcome to benefit the child.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Activity	Timeline	Completion and Evaluation
South Dakota Special Education Programs staff will review all procedures for conducting complaint investigations. Training and technical assistance is provided to ensure complaint investigators follow the procedural requirements under IDEA.	2006 and ongoing through 2011	Complaint investigators participate in the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Centers workgroup. Trainings have included: September 13, 2006 Ellen Gallegos presented information on the side by side comparison on complaint procedures and complaint procedures in federal register.
Special Education Programs will supply a complaint form on the web for easy access by individuals.	Spring 2006	This was completed and placed on the Special Education Programs website.
The complaint investigation handbook will be updated following IDEA 2004 final regulations.	2006 – 2007 school year	The complaint investigation handbook is in the process of being updated since the final regulations are in place.

A protocol will be maintained by Special Education Programs to ensure timelines and procedures are followed for complaint investigations.	2006 and ongoing through 2011	The protocol has been created and maintained. According to the data, South Dakota has met the target.
The state agency will contract with a regional resource center in the development of a system of complaint investigators who will contract with the state agency to facilitate complaint investigations.	2006 and ongoing through 2011	South Dakota will continue to contract with a regional resource center for complaint investigations. This process has been very effective for South Dakota as viewed in the data.
Update and disseminate Special Education Programs website and complaint investigation manual.	2006 and ongoing through 2011	Website has been updated and continues work on complaint investigation manual being completed.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:

[If applicable]

Discussion of Revision to Baseline data in the December 2005 State Performance Plan

In meeting with the stakeholder group and analyzing data, it was discovered that all dispute resolution data for Indicators 16, 17, and 19 were taken using data from the reporting period of September 1 through August 30th. The SPP has been revised to show the data from the correct reporting period of July 1 through June 30th. The stakeholder group wanted to be able to track the same time period from year to year.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: See pg. 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = $[(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) \text{ divided by } 3.2] \text{ times } 100.$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005	100% of due process hearings will be completed within the 45-day timeline, or have documentation of a timeline extended for exceptional purposes.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:**Target was met by South Dakota.**

SECTION C: Hearing requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	2
(3.1) Resolution sessions	0
(a) Settlement agreements	0
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	0
(a) Decisions within timeline	0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	0
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	1

SECTION D: Expedited hearing requests (related to disciplinary decision)	
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	0
(4.1) Resolution sessions	0

APR Template – Part B (4)

__South Dakota__
State

(a) Settlement agreements	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	0
(a) Change of placement ordered	0

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (2005):

Explanation of Progress:

South Dakota had two due process hearing requests for 2005-2006. One due process hearing request was filed June 30, 2006; the last day of the 2005-2006 reporting period. Neither request went to hearing. Both requests were resolved through mediation however; only one mediation agreement was reached by June 30, 2006.

South Dakota maintains a list of hearing officers and provides yearly training. The Due Process Hearing Officers are part of the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC) Due Process Hearing Officer Workgroup. They participate in teleconference calls every other month. The purpose of the teleconference calls is for Due Process Hearing Officers in the region to discuss issues unique to hearing officers, share ideas for improving skills, and refine their knowledge of special education law and procedure consistent with OSEP interpretation on legal and substantive issues relevant to a due process hearing.

The SPP/APR stakeholder group also felt that the South Dakota Navigator Program which is a SEP funded project through the South Dakota Parent Connection helps to keep the numbers of complaints, mediations and due process hearings low in South Dakota.

In the past year SD Navigator Program has assisted with 60 situations. That is a possible 60 less complaints, mediations or due process hearings for South Dakota Department of Education.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Activity	Timeline	Completion and Evaluations
The state will monitor the hearing process and timelines to ensure maintenance of 100% adjudication.	2005 and ongoing through 2011	South Dakota has a process in place to ensure timelines are met. South Dakota has met the target even though both hearings were resolved before hearings took place.
Provide training for legal assistant for the department concerning the updated regulations.	Fall 2006	Legal assistant attended training in North Dakota in the Fall of 2006 and will attend training by Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center in Winter of 2007.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005

[If applicable]

Discussion of Revision of Improvement Activity with Justification:

Activity	Timeline	Revision and Justification
Update Administrative Rules for South Dakota concerning due process hearings and resolution sessions when final federal regulations are complete.	Fall 2006 revised to Fall 2007	Due to final regulations not being final until early fall of 2006, updated Administrative Rules will be going through the process in South Dakota and will officially be updated by Spring of 2007

Revision to Baseline data in the December 2005 State Performance Plan

In meeting with the stakeholder group and analyzing data, it was discovered that all dispute resolution data for Indicators 16, 17, and 19 were taken using data from the reporting period of September 1 through August 30th. The SPP has been revised to show the data from the correct reporting period of July 1 through June 30th. The stakeholder group wanted to be able to track the same time period from year to year.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005	No targets need to be set if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10

Actual Target Data for 2005:

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (2005):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (2005)
[If applicable]

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: See pg. 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**Indicator 19:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005	No target necessary when state has less than 10 mediations

Actual Target Data for FFY 2005**Target was met by South Dakota.**

SECTION B: Mediation requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	5
(2.1) Mediations	
(a) Mediations related to due process	1
(i) Mediation agreements	1
(b) Mediations not related to due process	4
(i) Mediation agreements	4
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	0

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005**Explanation of Progress:**

South Dakota met the target for 2005 with all mediations held resulting in mediation agreements. The above mediation requests show mediations that were completed within the July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006 reporting timeframe.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Activity	Completion and evaluations
South Dakota tracks mediations to ensure timelines and procedures are followed.	All mediations were tracked and timelines were followed to ensure South Dakota met timelines for indicator.
Conduct trainings for school personnel and parents to utilize the Navigator Program. This program specializes in connecting a resource person with parents/guardians to assist them through the IEP process.	<p>Navigator Program coordinator presented in several workshops and groups to explain the Navigator Program. Presentations have been made to family support centers, state department of education staff from birth to 21 years, parent groups, CEC group, County Child Protection Group, transition council, SD Advocacy, along with many other groups. They have explained the program with almost 200 people.</p> <p>The Navigator Program personnel received initial training in February 2005. Since the program began, they have assisted in 65 situations.</p>
Train district representatives in conflict resolution to assist with the resolution session requirement of IDEA 2004	<p>92 District personnel were trained during workshops that were held at 3 locations across the state. 12 personnel from the Navigator Program also had one day training from CADRE.</p> <p>Evaluations from the training on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest) indicated the majority of participants gave it a 4 and found the training very beneficial.</p>
Recruit additional mediators	In July 2006, six mediators were trained to serve as mediators in South Dakota.
Conduct training for new and continuing mediators	In July 2006, mediation workshop and training was conducted. The first day was for district personnel to learn about the dispute resolution process and the second day was a training of six mediators.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005.

[If applicable]

Revision to Baseline data in the December 2005 State Performance Plan

In meeting with the stakeholder group and analyzing data, it was discovered that all dispute resolution data for Indicators 16, 17, and 19 were taken using data from the reporting period of

APR Template – Part B (4)

__South Dakota__
State

September 1 through August 30th. The SPP has been revised to show the data from the correct reporting period of July 1 through June 30th. The stakeholder group wanted to be able to track the same time period from year to year.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: See page 1****Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision****Indicator 20:** State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
(2005)	100% of required data reports will be accurate and 100 % will be submitted on time.

Actual Target Data for (2005):**Part A: Timely submissions – Target was met by South Dakota.**

a. All data was sent in a timely manner. The SPP was submitted on December 2, 2005. All 618 data was submitted by the timeline extension. South Dakota asked for and received permission for an extension for the November 1, 2005 and February 1, 2006 618 data submissions due to the loss of our data manager. South Dakota lost their data manager the middle of August 2005. A new data manager was not hired until the middle of October 2005 and did not start until November 2005.

100% of data reports were submitted on time.**Part B: Accuracy of data - Target was not met by South Dakota.**

b. 5 data tables were submitted for the 2005-2006 school year. If each data were assigned a point value of 20 points then the total points for all data tables would be 100. According to Westat, the average number of times a data table is submitted is 3 times. South Dakota Stakeholders decided any submission of 3 times or less can receive the full 20 points. This

allows for data accuracy. In using this formula, South Dakota would be able to compute a percentage for accuracy for data submissions using the following:

- Discipline table - 1 submission = 20 points
 - Exiting table – 3 submissions = 20 points
 - Personnel table – 3 submissions = 20 points
 - Child Count table – 7 submissions = 5 points
 - Placement/Environment table – 7 submissions = 5 points
- TOTAL = 70 points

70% accuracy of data reporting

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (2005):

Discussion of Progress and Slippage for 2005:

Special Education Programs (SEP) has appointed a program specialist to work with the Office of Data Collection data manager to ensure all data requests are accurate and are completed in a timely manner. This is a new position that came about due to the data collection concerns that occurred in 2005-2006.

The Stakeholder group reviewed and analyzing South Dakota's reasons for slippage in the accuracy of data and in having to have extensions for our data submissions. The SEP staff with input from stakeholders determined the following reasons for slippage:

- The data manager was new to the position in November of 2005. He did not have previous training in the data program South Dakota currently utilizes.
 - The data manager has since had training on the Student Information Management System (SIMS) system.
- The previous data manager did not have written procedures in place for completing the data tables utilizing the local district data thus the new data manager did not know what procedures had been previously followed.
 - The data manager has written procedures for completing the data tables.
- The state special education director was new to the position in August 2005. There were no written procedures concerning the data collection process and/or Special Education Programs role in this process.
 - Special Education Programs has assigned a staff person to work directly with the data manager to assist in data collection procedures and getting reliable data from district personnel.
 - Special Education Programs and the Office of Data Collection continue to work together to ensure mechanisms are in place for error free, consistent, valid and reliable data collection from the local districts.
- Local districts have not received training on the procedures for data collection for over three years. Special Education Programs in conjunction with data collections began training district personnel and creating a special education manual to assist for providing a more accurate data collection.

- Special Education Programs compiled a district training module on the SIMS system and Special Education data elements. This training was presented in November 2006. 120 district personnel attended the training.
- The training module was turned in to streaming videos and put on the SEP website along with the manual so districts can access both whenever needed.
- The Office of Data Collection, Infinite Campus, and Special Education Programs provided 40 local district personnel with one day training on the SIMS and DDN Campus data system in October 2006.
- 100 Special Education Directors were provided training on SIMS system and data collection in October 2006.
- 2006-2007 school year, SIMS coordinators are being interviewed during on-site monitoring to collect information on training needs of local districts.

Special Education Programs has partnered with the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). NCSEAM and Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC) met with Special Education Programs for a data and SPP training. Stakeholders were also in attendance. NCSEAM assisted South Dakota in ways to drill down and determine if noncompliance and/or performance below the target is systemic or localized. Some of the training consisted of:

- Training on what to look for in data at both the local and state level. How do you drill down?
- Completed Data Sources Table
- Discussed SPP targets and improvement activities
- Discussed how to utilize the OSEP puzzle pieces into our new monitoring system – Including the SPP Indicators

South Dakota has been working to ensure that procedures are in place at both the state and the local level which include:

- Instructions and/or guidance regarding correct data entry and validation of data reports and/process are provided by Special Education Programs and Office of Data Collection staff to LEAs.
 - Districts have a SIMS newsletter outlining the procedures for data collection.
 - The South Dakota Department of Education website keeps updated information available to district staff.
- Data edit reports (on-line and SEA Access reports)
 - Valid data entry (data definitions, cross reference criteria)
 - Reporting reliability following OSEP/Westat flagging criteria.
- Post submission LEA verification and sign off on reported data.
- Post data submission audit of selected districts, based on:
 - Overall change in total numbers of students

APR Template – Part B (4)

__South Dakota__
State

- Past data reporting accuracy
- At random selection
- State funding formula review (state formula also utilizes disability counts for funding allocation calculations)
 - It is in the districts best interest to accurately report students. Any monitored misreporting of data may cause districts to return or lessen state funded allocations.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Activity	Timeline	Completion and Evaluations
Data manager has created step by step protocol for the collection of child count data along with other data collections and reporting.	February 2006 and updates on-going as data collection changes	Completed and will continue to be updated.
All districts are sent data on State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report to be reviewed and verified to ensure all data reported is accurate for state and district reporting	January 2007 and on-going	As districts review SPP data for accuracy, several clarifications were made. Districts are now looking at their special education coding and data collection more closely to catch any errors in reporting on their part.
Training for new data manager	Beginning October 24, 2005 / on going through 2007	The new data manager attended the data managers meeting, went to a special training at Harcourt for assessment data, and had training with Infinite Campus on the SIMS system
Training on data entry for district SIMS coordinators	2006 and ongoing through 2011	A one day training was provided to SIMS coordinators in the state. A SIMS manual for Special Education Data Reporting was developed. The training and the manual was put on the web.
Special Education Programs will obtain previous, current and future data from data manager; to be stored on a common shared drive. (SPED Profiles)	Spring 2006 and ongoing through 2011	SPED Profiles is put on a shared drive so SEP has access to the district and state data.
Create a timeline for all parties involved who collect data; to ensure	Summer 2006 and updated	A timeline has been created and is followed by SEP and district personnel.

APR Template – Part B (4)

__South Dakota__
State

timely and accurate data collection	annually through 2011	
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities /
Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005**
[If applicable]